UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social
Council

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/1994/SR.69
23 March 1994

Original: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Fiftieth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 69th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 11 March 1994, at 10 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. van WULFFTEN PALTHE (Netherlands)

CONTENTS

Organization of the work of the session (continued)

Draft provisional agenda for the fifty-first session of the Commission

Report to the Economic and Social Council on the fiftieth session of the Commission

Closure of the session

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Commission at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.94-12332 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 8.10 p.m.

ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE SESSION (agenda item 3) (continued) (E/CN.4/1994/127, E/CN.4/1994/L.104)

DRAFT PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE FIFTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE COMMISSION (agenda item 25) (E/CN.4/1994/127, E/CN.4/1994/L.104, E/CN.4/1994/L.1)

Draft decision (E/CN.4/1994/L.104)

1. The CHAIRMAN, responding to inquiries about the relationship between the draft decision contained in document E/CN.4/1994/L.104 and the draft provisional agenda contained in document E/CN.4/1994/L.1, said that, under the rules of procedure, the Commission recommended a draft provisional agenda (E/CN.4/1994/L.1) to the next session. If it was decided to establish an open-ended inter-sessional working group to deal, inter alia, with the question of a draft provisional agenda, the fifty-first session of the Commission would then have before it the draft provisional agenda contained in document E/CN.4/1994/L.1 plus any recommendations formulated by the working group. The final decision on the agenda would be made by the fifty-first session of the Commission, and not by the current session or by an inter-sessional working group.

2. Since he had received no comments on draft decision E/CN.4/1994/L.104 earlier in the day, he had assumed that it had met with the approval of all members of the Commission. Numerous amendments had then been proposed in the afternoon. He had made it clear to the officers and to the regional coordinators that a limited number of those amendments would be considered on the understanding that the draft decision would then be adopted without a vote, as was customary when proposals were submitted by the Chairman. As the Commission had had the draft decision before it for four days, the last-minute suggestions did not seem to be a particularly efficient way of conducting its work. The draft decision he had submitted took into consideration the Commission's deliberations on the question and discussions he had held with individuals and all regional groups. His task had not been easy, as there had been virtually no consensus on the holding of an inter-sessional working group or on what its tasks should be.

3. He wished to read out the amendments to the draft decision which had been agreed upon. In the first paragraph, the words "recalling decision 1993/98 of 12 March 1993, entitled 'rationalization of the work of the Commission'," should be inserted after the words "Commission on Human Rights". In subparagraph (a), the words "deciding upon" should be changed to "proposing". In the final paragraph, after "the Commission on Human Rights", the following words should be inserted: "decides that the work of the Working Group will be conducted on a basis of consensus and requests the Chairman of the Working Group to report to the Commission at its fifty-first session". The amendments which he had just read out enjoyed wide support and it was his hope that the draft decision could be adopted without a vote. It if could not and further changes were proposed, he would withdraw the draft decision.

4. Mr. KHOURY (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the additions read out by the Chairman were essential but that his delegation would appreciate having some time to study the amendments in order to determine whether they addressed its concerns.

5. The CHAIRMAN noted that the provisions of the draft decision had already been discussed for four and a half hours and that interpretation services would be provided to the Commission until 10 p.m. only. He insisted that action must be taken on the draft decision or that he would withdraw it.

6. Mr. ALAEE (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the draft decision should reflect the balance contained in its predecessor, resolution 1993/98, between rationalization and the reclustering and restructuring of the agenda. His delegation had put forward many proposals that day aimed at incorporating the word "rationalization" in the draft decision in order to achieve such a balance. In a spirit of cooperation and in the order to save time, his delegation was prepared to withdraw its earlier suggestions and request the following revisions: the word "recalling" in the first paragraph should be replaced by the word "reaffirming". That was the least the Commission could do in order to achieve consistency with draft resolution 1993/98. In addition, the word "possible" in subparagraph (c) should be deleted.

7. The CHAIRMAN expressed the fear that one change might lead to another.

8. Mr. FASSEHUN (Nigeria) said that he appreciated the Chairman's efforts and that the Commission wished to be cooperative, but that a draft decision satisfactory to all would be far preferable to a draft decision that was controversial or problematic. He hoped that some time would be granted to those delegations wishing to review the changes.

9. Mr. KHOURY (Syrian Arab Republic) agreed with the Iranian delegation's remarks concerning the balanced nature of resolution 1993/98, which formed the basis for the draft decision to be adopted now. Unfortunately, the desired balance between the rationalization of the Commission's work and the rationalization of the draft provisional agenda had not yet been achieved. If the spirit of resolution 1993/98 were not reflected in the draft decision, his delegation would be unable to support it.

10. The CHAIRMAN said that, if the Syrian delegation was not prepared to adopt the draft decision, he would have to withdraw it.

11. Mr. KHOURY (Syrian Arab Republic) stressed that his delegation would have agreed to the draft decision, had it reflected the balance contained in resolution 1993/98. He was not seeking to introduce new elements but rather to reaffirm the contents of a resolution already adopted by consensus.

12. Mr. QADER (Bangladesh) supported the Nigerian statement. In all multinational forums, it was standard practice to give delegations with difficulties additional time to consult. Delegations which had requested time

to review were not seeking to impede progress. His delegation supported the constructive changes proposed by the Iranian delegation. It believed that two minor changes would not necessarily lead to many other changes.

13. Mr. NANJIRA (Kenya) said that the Chairman's much appreciated efforts should be aimed at facilitating decision-making but that the actual decision-making was the prerogative of the Commission. Delegations were accountable to their Governments and were not in a position to deal with a draft decision on a "take-it-or-leave-it" basis. He hoped that the concerns of certain delegations, or their need to consult their Governments, would be respected. He did not believe that delegations should be threatened.

14. Mr. HYNES (Canada), noting that his delegation had participated very actively in discussions of the draft decision as coordinator of the Group of Western European and Other States, said that it understood the Chairman's reluctance to introduce further changes, especially since many concessions had already been made in the amendments he had read out. It had also listened carefully, however, to the Bangladeshi, Kenyan and Iranian representatives. His delegation was prepared to accept the replacement of "recalling" by "reaffirming". It felt that the second Iranian proposal made little material or significant difference. His delegation suggested adopting the draft decision with the amendments read out by the Chairman and the revisions proposed by the Iranian representative. If that were not possible, it would understand that the Chairman might wish to withdraw the proposal.

15. Mr. CHABÉN (Uruguay) urged the Chairman not to withdraw the draft decision, for his delegation - and no doubt many others which had not voiced an opinion - supported the text as amended. His delegation was also prepared to support the Iranian proposals, which did not significantly alter the draft decision. However, it hoped that the sovereign right of all States to hold dissenting views would be respected as well. It urged all delegations to help to demonstrate to the international community that the Commission could achieve a consensus, recalling that a consensus had been achieved at the World Conference on Human Rights on issues that were infinitely more complicated than that before the Commission.

16. Mr. EICHER (United States of America) supported the Uruguayan statement and said that, on the whole, the draft decision struck a reasonable balance. In a spirit of consensus, his delegation was prepared to accept the draft decision and the amendments the Chairman had read out. He hoped that the Chairman would not withdraw the text and that other delegations would wish to join in the consensus.

17. Mr. BROTODININGRAT (Indonesia) said that his delegation's silence thus far should be construed as a show of support. His delegation strongly supported the Canadian proposal to adopt the draft decision as orally revised by the Iranian representative.

18. Mr. PANG Sen (China) acknowledged the Chairman's hard work with regard to an issue to which all delegations attached importance. The members of the Commission did not want the Chairman to feel that his efforts had been in vain but, at the same time, it was important that all Member States should be satisfied with the draft decision. The Commission was very close to arriving

at a consensus text. Since it did not yet have before it the final version of the report on its work at the fiftieth session, there was still time to continue to seek a consensus. He hoped the Chairman would consider the Canadian and Nigerian appeals. If no consensus had been achieved by the time the Commission was ready to adopt its report, the Chairman could then withdraw his text.

19. Mr. PORTALES (Chile) said that, by taking into account the observations made by the Iranian and Canadian representatives, consensus text could be achieved. No one could legitimately dispute the use of the word "reaffirming" in connection with a resolution adopted by consensus at the forty-ninth session; the other change proposed by the Iranian representative did not significantly alter the text. He appealed to the Commission to adopt the draft decision by consensus as orally revised by the Iranian delegation.

20. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that, while his delegation wished to join the consensus, it still had certain general problems with the text, which the minor changes suggested by a number of African and Asian delegations would eliminate. The accommodating spirit shown by the Canadian delegation should help the Commission to reach a consensus. If that were not possible, the text could be withdrawn.

21. Mr. VERGNE SABOIA (Brazil) said that, like Indonesia, his delegation had remained silent because it basically agreed with the proposed text. However, it had listened carefully to the revisions and observations put forward by a number of delegations and agreed, in particular, with the Canadian, Uruguayan and Chilean statements that the Iranian proposals would not substantially alter the text. By incorporating those minor changes, the Commission could achieve the desired consensus and the working group could begin its very important work.

22. Mr. URRUTIA (Peru) agreed that, in the interest of achieving the desired consensus, the Iranian proposal should be accepted. In that connection, his delegation supported the Canadian, Indonesian and other statements. It also appealed to those delegations which still had difficulties with the draft decision to agree to the Iranian revisions and adopt the text by consensus. The Commission should be motivated by the larger concern of adapting its agenda to a new international reality.

23. Mr. HALINEN (Finland) stressed the need for constructive, positive and forwarding-looking action. That could be more easily achieved by adopting the draft decision than by not adopting it. To that end, despite certain problems his delegation had with the text, it supported its adoption as orally revised by the Iranian delegation.

24. Mr. SIRAJ (Malaysia) welcomed the Canadian suggestion and said that the Chairman's fine work could be salvaged by taking a little more time to consolidate support for the text among the members of the Commission. To that end, his delegation, like many others, strongly supported the Iranian proposal.

25. Mr. SOB (Cameroon) said that his delegation had listened with interest to the Iranian proposal and supported the Canadian and Uruguayan proposals for speedy action on the draft decision.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that he had listened very carefully to the comments made. Given the wide support enjoyed by the Iranian proposal, he would be pleased to incorporate the changes in question if that would enable the Commission to adopt the draft decision.

27. Draft decision E/CN.4/1994/L.4, as amended, was adopted without a vote.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that, under agenda item 3, he had been requested to read out the text of a draft decision entitled "Organization of the work of the fifty-first session":

> "At its 69th meeting, on 11 March 1994, the Commission, taking into account its heavy schedule of work, as well as the need to give adequate consideration to all the items on the agenda, and recalling that in previous years the Economic and Social Council had approved the Commission's request for additional meetings for its thirty-seventh to fiftieth sessions, decided, without a vote: (a) to recommend to the Economic and Social Council that it authorize, if possible within existing financial resources, 40 fully serviced additional meetings, including summary records, in accordance with rules 29 and 31 of the rules of procedure of the functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council, for the Commission's fifty-first session, and (b) to request the Chairman of the Commission at its fifty-first session to make every effort to organize the work of the session within the time normally allotted, the additional meetings that the Economic and Social Council might authorize to be utilized only if such meetings proved to be absolutely necessary."

29. The draft decision read out by the Chairman was adopted without a vote.

30. Mr. LEBAKINE (Secretary of the Commission), in response to the Cuban request under rule 28 of the rules of procedure concerning the programme budget implications of draft resolution E/CN.4/1994/L.79 entitled "Situation of human rights in Cuba", read out the following statement:

> "Draft resolution E/CN.4/1994/L.79 provides for the extension by one year of the mandate entrusted to the Special Rapporteur. The requirements for 1994, which are estimated at some US$ 36,000, will be absorbed from within provisions made for Economic and Social Council human rights mandates under section 21 of the 1994-1995 programme budget."

31. Regarding other draft resolutions which had financial implications for the regular budget of the Centre for Human Rights, he read out the following statement:

"In the course of the current session, the Commission has adopted a number of draft resolutions that had financial implications for the regular budget of the Centre for Human Rights in 1994 and following years. These resolutions relate to new mandates or existing mandates which have been significantly expanded in scope.

"In accordance with financial regulation 13.1 and rule 28 of the rules of procedure of the functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council, statements on the administrative and programme budget implications of the proposals contained in the resolutions have to be prepared for consideration by the Economic and Social Council.

"These statements have been submitted in draft form to the Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Finance at United Nations headquarters for review and clearance.

"At the same time, when adopting the resolutions, members of the Commission were informed orally of the estimated costs involved in the implementation of the requests contained in the resolutions.

"Due to time constraints, the statements on administrative and programme budget implications could not be reproduced before the conclusion of the fiftieth session.

"Once finalized, the statements will be published in an annex to the report of the Commission. These documents will then be submitted to the Economic and Social Council, in the context of its review of the report of the fiftieth session of the Commission."

32. The CHAIRMAN drew the Commission's attention to the fact that the draft provisional agenda for the fifty-first session of the Commission (E/CN.4/1994/L.1), was entirely technical and indicative in nature and did not require any action to be taken by the Commission. If Commission members had no comments concerning it, he would take it that the Commission wished to take note of the document.

33. Mr. PEREZ NOVOA (Cuba) inquired about the legal basis for taking note of the provisional agenda rather than adopting it outright. Its adoption would not be irrevocable since it was, in any case, provisional. It could still be supplemented by an agenda elaborated by the inter-sessional working group and be finalized at the fifty-first session of the Commission.

34. The CHAIRMAN referred to rule 5 of the rules of procedure whereby the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Chairman, drew up a provisional agenda, on the clear understanding that each session was to adopt its own agenda. He also referred to rule 7 of the rules of procedure whereby each session adopted its agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda submitted to it. That procedure had been followed by the Commission for the past 50 sessions.

35. Mr. PEREZ NOVOA (Cuba) insisted that the difference was that, at previous sessions, the Commission had adopted, rather than taken note of, the provisional agenda. Taking note was not the same as adopting a provisional agenda, subject to the provisions of rule 7 of the rules of procedure.

36. The CHAIRMAN specified that the Commission was taking note of and deciding to recommend the provisional agenda to the fifty-first session of the Commission. If there were no further comments, he would take it that the Commission agreed to proceed accordingly.

37. It was so decided.

REPORT TO THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ON THE FIFTIETH SESSION OF THE COMMISSION (agenda item 26) (E/CN.4/1994/L.10 and Add.1-21 and E/CN.4/1994/L.11 and Add.1-9)

38. Mr. NGOUBEYOU (Cameroon), Rapporteur, introduced the two-part draft report of the Commission. The first part, which dealt mainly with the various agenda items, was contained in document E/CN.4/1994/L.10 and Add.1-21. The second part consisted of the 97 resolutions and 102 decisions adopted by the current session of the Commission, including recommendations for action by the Economic and Social Council and was contained in documents E/CN.4/1994/L.11 and Add.1-9. The chapters of the draft report were essentially procedural in nature, the substance of the debates being reflected in summary records E/CN.4/1994/SR.1-69. Delegations wishing to introduce substantive changes to the draft chapters should submit them to the Secretariat within a period of 10 days from the time the report was issued. Typographical errors would also be corrected in the final version. The final report, together with its annexes, would be submitted to the Economic and Social Council at its regular session of June 1994. He would ensure the distribution of the final report in all official languages. In conclusion, he expressed appreciation to the members of the Commission for placing their confidence in him and to the Secretariat for its assistance.

39. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Commission should adopt each addendum, one by one, subject to availability. Following the practice of previous years, the Rapporteur could take due note of all comments made in order to incorporate corrections into the final report. It would also be understood that, where certain sections of the report were not yet available in all official languages, they would be adopted ad referendum. Corrections could then be submitted as the documents became available under the procedure explained by the Rapporteur.

40. Mr. PEREZ NOVOA (Cuba) drew the Commission's attention to draft resolution 1994/65 on human rights and the environment, contained in document E/CN.4/1994/L.11/Add.7. A number of delegations which had joined the consensus on that draft resolution had requested clarification concerning paragraphs 9, 10 and 11. It had been agreed in the negotiating process that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote on the condition that those paragraphs were deleted. He requested the appropriate correction to be made.

41. Mr. CHABEN (Uruguay) proposed that, since a number of addenda to the report had not yet been issued, the entire report should be adopted ad referendum, on the understanding that delegations would have the 10-day time period in which to submit their remarks or corrections. That would provide an opportunity to study the report more carefully.

42. Mr. BROTODININGRAT (Indonesia) said that, before the Commission decided to adopt the entire report ad referendum, he wished to draw attention to the fact that his delegation's vote on draft resolution E/CN.4/1994/L.82 had been incorrectly recorded.

43. Mr. NANJIRA (Kenya) supported the Uruguayan proposal and pointed out that the correction requested by the Indonesian delegation could be made under the procedure outlined by the Rapporteur. He was somewhat concerned by the proviso that the report must remain confidential for 10 days and that, once adopted, it might be subject to change. He hoped that, barring specific amendments or corrections by certain delegations, there would be no substantive changes.

44. Mr. CHANDRA (India) endorsed the Uruguayan and Kenyan proposals to adopt the report and allow a 10-day period for the submission of corrections in writing. His delegation would request, in writing, the deletion of paragraph 29 from document E/CN.4/1994/L.10/Add.12, which was factually incorrect.

45. Mrs. PAZ (Mexico) agreed with the Uruguayan proposal but also reiterated her delegation's request formulated at the time it had introduced resolution 1994/58 on assistance to Guatemala in the field of human rights. Noting inconsistencies between the English and French version of the resolution, she requested that corrections be made on the basis of the Spanish text originally submitted as a draft resolution.

46. Mr. GOONETILLEKE (Sri Lanka), said that, in consultation with the Canadian delegation, his delegation had proposed an amendment to the first line of paragraph 24, in document E/CN.4/1994/L.10/Add.12. The amendment had already been submitted to the Secretariat.

47. Mr. GANAPATHY (Malaysia) drew attention to paragraph 96 of the same document and asked whether it could read "draft resolution E/CN.4/1994/L.86 was introduced by Malaysia and co-sponsored by the following countries". Similar corrections should be made concerning the resolutions on the situation of human rights in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina (para. 81) and the situation of human rights in Kosovo (para. 90), which had been introduced by the Pakistani delegation.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Commission wished to adopt the entire report ad referendum, it being understood that delegations had 10 days as of Monday, 14 March 1994 to submit their comments to the Secretariat.

49. It was so decided.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

50. Mr. FALL (Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights) said that, while the Commission could not wave a magic wand and eliminate all the massive human rights violations in the world, it had rekindled the hopes of many persons and groups. That message of hope and faith in the United Nations activities for the preservation of human rights and fundamental freedoms must now be disseminated through the work of the Commission's special rapporteurs, special representatives, independent experts and working groups.

51. In quantitative terms, the Commission had been honoured by the participation of a record number of eminent personalities, including heads of State and Government, Ministers for Foreign Affairs, Ministers of Justice and Ministers of Human Rights, the leaders of intergovernmental organizations and, for the first time in the history of the Organization, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. The Commission had heard more than 400 statements by members or observers, studied 127 basic documents and 54 NGO communications. In the spirit of cooperation which had prevailed at the World Conference on Human Rights, it had adopted 109 resolutions and decisions, 88 of them by consensus.

52. In qualitative terms, the Commission had made the basic rights of women and children one of its main concerns, in particular, through the appointment of a special rapporteur on violence against women and the establishment of two open-ended inter-sessional working groups for the elaboration of draft optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. It had also contributed significantly to the elaboration of programmes under the Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People and the Decade for Human Rights Education.

53. The appointment of a special rapporteur on independence and impartiality of the judiciary, jurors and assessors and the independence of lawyers had been informed by the Commission's balanced approach in which civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights and the right to development were deemed equally important. In connection with its consideration of the human rights situations in various countries of the world, the Commission, during the second phase of its work, had laid the groundwork for broad, forward-looking human rights activities. Those activities would focus on monitoring, technical assistance and consultations. In that connection, the Centre for Human Rights already planned to hold a general meeting of special rapporteurs, special representatives and independent experts. Within the limits of the human and financial resources available to it, it would do its utmost to provide support services in the execution of the mandates established or extended by the Commission.

54. In conclusion, he wished to congratulate the Chairman, the officers and the members of the Commission on the manner in which they had conducted their work.

55. The CHAIRMAN said that the success of the Commission's fiftieth session must be evaluated in the light of its main purpose, namely, the protection and promotion of human rights.

56. At the World Conference on Human Rights, the international community had avoided a catastrophic lack of consensus and agreed on a final document with many positive elements. The Vienna Conference had marked the achievement of consensus - for the first time - on the right to development and had confirmed the legitimacy of international concern for human rights. Consensus had also been achieved on the need for increased funding for United Nations human rights activities and the need for enhanced advisory services.

57. It had been hoped by many that the consensus and results achieved at Vienna would carry over into the fiftieth session of the Commission and facilitate its work. In some cases, the Commission had been able to adapt to changing realities, for example by adopting a more future-oriented focus on South Africa and taking positive action with regard to the rights of women. On other issues, however, agreement seemed even more elusive than it had before the Vienna Conference. The Middle East had remained a highly controversial topic and the consensus on the right to development had collapsed. The debate on the draft resolution on racism had been more protracted than necessary but, as a result, the question of anti-semitism had been addressed for the first time in the history of the United Nations. Unfortunately, though understandably, certain long-standing disagreements had been more acute because of a sort of negotiating fatigue following the Vienna Conference. As long as there was dialogue and a will to proceed, however, there was hope for the future. The Commission should cease to hold repetitive debates on preferences and priorities or use one theme to impede progress on another. Nor should one set of rights be given preference over others. All rights were equal and deserved equal attention.

58. Sufficient resources must be provided to supervise the implementation of the Commission's decisions. Once again, the Commission had decided to establish new and important mandates without considering the consequences for the Centre for Human Rights. In view of the zero growth in the budget and the concern about draining much needed resources from other areas, no solution was in sight. Human rights were a top priority of the United Nations and all Member States must take action to ensure that that was reflected in the budget. The Secretariat and the mechanisms created by the Commission itself must also receive stronger support. That was particularly vital following the Vienna Conference. Proper staffing was required in order to ensure the implementation of supervisory mandates decided upon by the Commission. In order for the increased budget to be effective, some independence would have to be granted to the Centre for Human Rights as well. He hoped that those needs would be addressed by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

59. The High Commissioner would also have a role to play in the area of human rights improvement through the more effective use of advisory services in cooperation with other United Nations programmes. The advisory services programme should also focus more heavily on the valuable recommendations formulated by the Commission's special rapporteurs and independent experts. Too often, they had been ignored. Interconnected with advisory services was the Vienna Conference theme of human rights, development and democracy, which should be highlighted in order to create societies free from human rights violations.

60. He also hoped that the Commission would function in a more orderly fashion at the fifty-first session and during the inter-sessional period. Speakers must be allowed to be heard, decisions must be made with clarity and there must be a logical order of the day. The reordering of the agenda and a discussion of related matters would help the Commission to see its priorities more clearly and adapt to changing realities.

61. He appealed to members of the Commission to cooperate with treaty bodies, special rapporteurs and working groups, and to provide constructive, forward-looking ideas with a view to improving human rights. The necessary funds for human rights must also be appropriated in other bodies of the United Nations. While there was room for criticism, it should be voiced in the proper manner; it should not be aimed at preventing Commission members from entering into a dialogue on the human rights situation in a certain country.

62. The Commission could not afford to waste time or money when human rights were at stake. He hoped that the inter-sessional meeting on the agenda and organizational matters would result in a more effective and efficient fifty-first session. He also hoped that certain minor failures of the fiftieth session had been due to post-Vienna fatigue and that its successes would be built upon at the next session.

63. He expressed his thanks to the members of the Secretariat, particularly the Secretary of the Commission, to the officers and to all delegations. Above all, he hoped that the words that had been spoken in the meeting room would have a greater bearing on reality. The Commission had a duty to continue to use strong language where necessary and to offer understanding and advice. He feared that many more sessions of the Commission would be held before the world became a safe place, but that was an effort that would simply have to be made.

64. After the customary exchange of courtesies, The CHAIRMAN declared the session closed.

The meeting rose at 10.05 p.m.